



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/712,584	11/14/2000	Daniel Arturo Delfin Farias	SJO919990173	9711

24033 7590 06/28/2004

KONRAD RAYNES & VICTOR, LLP  
315 S. BEVERLY DRIVE  
# 210  
BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90212

EXAMINER

O CONNOR, GERALD J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3627	

DATE MAILED: 06/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
09/712,584

Applicant(s)  
Farias et al.

Examiner  
O'Connor

Art Unit  
3627



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE three MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on December 29, 2003 (Amdt "C") and January 29, 2004 (RCE).
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-69 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) none is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-69 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on Nov 14, 2000 is/are a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some\* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other:

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on Dec 29, 2003 (Paper N<sup>o</sup> 16) has been entered.

### ***Preliminary Remarks***

2. This Office action responds to the amendment and arguments filed by applicant on December 29, 2003 (Paper N<sup>o</sup> 16) in reply to the Office action mailed September 29, 2003.

3. The amendment of claims 1, 13, 18, 20-24, 27-29, 32, 37, 39, and 58 by applicant in Paper N<sup>o</sup> 16 is hereby acknowledged.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-38, 58-67 and 69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art, as described in the written specification, in view of Johnson et al. (US 5,712,989).

The admitted prior art includes a method of ordering products that comprises performing all of the recited sequence of operations/steps/functions, but only includes performing certain of the steps using a computer, leaving other of the steps to be performed manually, and does not appear to include the step of “performing computer-related operations to process information from the supplier indicating a commitment quantity of a number of the products the supplier intends to ship to the RSC to meet the requested quantity.”

However, Johnson et al. disclose a similar method of ordering products, and the method of Johnson et al. indeed includes the step of performing computer-related operations to process information from the supplier indicating a commitment 372 quantity of a number of the products the supplier intends to ship to the RSC to meet the requested quantity.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have modified the known prior art system so as to include the step of performing computer-related operations to process information from the supplier indicating a commitment quantity of a number of the products the supplier intends to ship to the RSC to meet the requested quantity, in accordance with the teachings of Johnson et al., in order to improve the integrity/reliability of the method by making use of computer-based records of orders, inventory, and transactions.

6. Claims 39-57 and 68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art, as described in the written specification, in view of Johnson et al. (US 5,712,989), and further in view of Graves et al. (US H1743).

Graves et al. disclose a computer method for ordering products by means of a network of computers, which computer method clearly anticipates the instant claims, except that the method of Graves et al. involves only two entities (a manufacturer ordering directly from a supplier) rather than three entities (a manufacturer, receiving supplies from a distributor/middleman, the distributor/middleman first receiving the supplies from a supplier).

However, the third party distributors/middlemen are well known to those of ordinary skill in the art, hence, obvious elements to include in such a method. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have modified the computer method of Graves et al. so as to duplicate its functionality, as required, to form a three link supply chain instead of a two link supply chain, in order to accommodate an intermediate third party, such as a distributor/middleman, since so doing could be performed readily and easily by any person of ordinary skill in the art, with neither undue experimentation, nor risk of unexpected results, and since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8.

*Response to Arguments*

7. Applicant's arguments filed December 29, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

8. The arguments regarding the previous prior art rejections have been considered, but have been rendered moot by applicant's amendment, and the consequent new grounds of rejection.

*Conclusion*

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the disclosure.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication, or earlier communications, should be directed to the examiner, **Jerry O'Connor**, whose telephone number is **(703) 305-1525**, and whose facsimile number is **(703) 746-3976**.

The examiner can normally be reached weekdays from 9:30 to 6:00.

Inquiries of a general nature or simply relating to the status of the application should be directed to the receptionist, whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Robert Olszewski, can be reached at (703) 308-5183.

Official replies to this Office action may be submitted by any *one* of fax, mail, or hand delivery. **Faxed replies are preferred and should be directed to (703) 872-9306 (fax-back**

Application: 09/712,584

Paper No. 20

Art Unit: 3627

Page 6

auto-reply receipt service provided). Mailed replies should be addressed to "Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450." Hand delivered replies should be left with the receptionist on the seventh floor of Crystal Park Five, 2451 Crystal Dr, Arlington, VA 22202.

GJOC

March 19, 2004



Gerald J. O'Connor

Patent Examiner

Group Art Unit 3627